DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 623 **HE 011 355**

AUTHOR	Saxe, Joel
TITLE	South Africa Divestiture. Target Report No. 11.
INSTITUTION	United States Student Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 79
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism; Blacks; Educational Economics; Endowment Funds; Ethics; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Historical Reviews; *Investment; *Political Issues; Politics; *Racial Discrimination; *School Industry Relationship; Student Opinion; Student Organizations; Student Publications
IDENTIFIERS	*Divestiture; Lobbying; Position Papers; *South Africa

ABSTRACT

This student resource guide prepared by the South Africa Catalyst Project for the United States Student Association (USSA) focuses on the student anti-apartheid movement and divestiture activities of American students. Divestiture of university-held stock in U.S. corporations operating in South Africa is the major focus of the student anti-apartheid movement. The USSA is seeking to apply pressure to U.S. corporations and the U.S. government to cease their support of the apartheid economy and military apparatus of South Africa. The history and activities of the U.S. student anti-apartheid movement are summarized. The escalation of student actions in the spring of 1978 in support of college and university divestiture is described. The USSA estimates that 110 schools have anti-apartheid groups. The goals and objectives of the movement are outlined and problems and challenges to divestiture are discussed. The process by which students can investigate university investments is explained, as well as various methods that can be used for divestiture including shareholder resolutions. A discussion of the administration's response to student pressure for divestiture centers on administration-sponsored Investment Advisory Councils and the Sullivan principles. Conflicts of interest relating to the divestiture problem and objections to the sale of Kruggerands in the U.S. are also discussed. A list of resources for anti-apartheid organizing is appended. (BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172623

Target Report

South Africa Divestiture

No.11

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NSA-NSL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Each year American colleges and universities invest millions of dollars in South Africa, supporting its racist regime and the oppression of Blacks in South Africa. Student fees and tuition should not fund a morally indecent country such as South Africa. The movement for Divestiture has spread to many schools, and most notabiy to Stanford University in California where riots took place. This report suggests ways you can begin divestiture action on your campus and discusses the inhumanity of the apartheid government.

HE 011 355

NSA-NSL

A publication of the United States Student Association

Report prepared by the South Africa Catalyst Project - Joel Saxe © 1979 March

TARGET REPORT NO. 11: SOUTH AFRICA DIVESTITURE
A publication of the United States Student Associaiton © 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1

2. Why South Africa?
Excerpts from a Princeton pamphlet 2

3. The Student Anti-Apartheid Movement 3

4. University Investments: Where to Begin 7

5. Shareholder Resolutions:
Arguments For and Against Their Use 9

6. Administration Response I:
Administration-sponsored Investment Advisory
Committees 11

7. Administration Response II:
The Sullivan Principles 12

8. Other Targets of University Complicity
with Apartheid 14

9. The National Anti-Apartheid Movement:
Actions to Oppose U.S. Involvement and Support
the Liberation Movements 14

10. Resource List 16

INTRODUCTION

This student resource guide about the student anti-apartheid movement was prepared by the South Africa Catalyst Project specifically forthe U.S. Student Association. Be describing divestiture activities of American students, we hope to enable tyou to bring the issue of apartheid and U.S. involvement in Southern Africa to your campus. We urge you to take action --- education, research, petitioning, negotiating with administrators --- whatever you deem appropriate, to shed light on university links to racism and exploitation in Southern Africa.

If you would like to follow up ideas in this guide or desire more details on either organizing tactics or South Africa, please let us know. The Catalyst Project can provide you with its more comprehensive guide, ORGANIZE (75 pp. 1978 $2.00), ANTI-APARTHEID ORGANIZING: On Campus and Beyond (75 pp., 1979 $2.00) or a pamphlet,"U.S. Investment in South Africa. " Write or call the offices listed below.

The South Africa Catlayst Project

3470 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto, California 94306
(415)494-0355

Box 177
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

For more copies of USSA's TARGET REPORT NO. 11, write USSA Publications, Suite 300, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 or call (202)667-6000. ($1.00 each)

WHY SOUTH AFRICA?

Excerpts from a pamphlet by the Princeton Peoples Front for the Liberation of Southern Africa.

What is apartheid?

Apartheid is the system in South Africa by which the ruling white minority maintains domination over the labor of the black majority. Blacks, who constitute 71% of the population, are legally restricted to 13% of the land, in desolate, impovershed areas called "homelands." There is so little work in the homelands that most black men have no choice but to work in the "white" areas, where they have no political rights. Their families are not permitted to accompany them to the white areas.

The average black wage is below the Poverty Datum Line, an index defined as a bare-survival income. Annual per capita income in $2500 for whites, $172 for blacks(1975 data). Malnutrition kills one out of every two black children in the homelands before the age of 5.

What is the role of American corporations in South Africa?

U.S corporations provide goods and services for the white market and for the apartheid governemnt. They are concentrated in strategic sectors such as oil, computers, automative, and rubber--industries in which South Africa is not self-sufficient. For example, South Africa must import virtually all its oil. But U.S. investment and bank loans are gradually helping the apartheid regime to become economically impervious to outside pressure, especially in the energy sector.

Senator Dick Clark(D-Iowa) has summarized the conclusions of a recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee study:

> "American capital and credit have played a pivotal role in assisting the South African government to entrench its policies of apartheid...The net effect of American investment has been to strengthen the economic and military self-sufficiency of South Africa's apartheid regime, undermining the fundamental goals and objectives of U.S. foreign policy."

U.S. corporations pay taxes to the apartheid regime, and cooperate with restrictive apartheid laws. Under the recently enacted National Supplies Procurement Act, their facilities are subject to immediate convers ion to war production in the event of a "security emergency", such as an uprising by South Africa's black population. Also, U.S. corporate assets serve as an "American hostage" which influences U.S. government policy toward South Africa.

What about specific corporations in which Princeton invests?

Princeton's investments include: IBM, South Africa's largest computer company; Caltex, Mobil, and Shell, South Africa's three largest oil companies; General Motors, South Africa's largest railroad locomotive company; Firestone, South Africa's largest tire company; and J.P. Morgan, a bank which has participated in over half a billion dollars of loans to South Africa.

What is our task?

We seek to apply pressure to U.S. corporations and the U.S. governemnt to cease their support of the apartheid economy and military apparatus. Pressure in the U.S. has already induced Polaroid to withdraw; Control Data to curtail its activities; and Citibank and other banks to refuse loans to the Vorster regime.

We should remember that while U.S. corporations are very important to the apartheid economy, the reverse is not the case: South African operations constitute only a small fraction of the business of most of these multinational corporations. Thus, the way to force the corporations to withdraw is for our actions to make the costs here at home of continued complicity with apartheid greater than the benefits: costs in terms of bad publicity, decreased sales, and above all, losses in political power and legitimacy.

The Student Anti-Apartheid Movement

Inspired by the youth of Soweto, students all across the United States have joined a growing movement in support of the Southern African liberation forces and opposed to U.S. involvement in Southern Africa. In every part of the country, involving literally thousands of students, the movement against apartheid is showing itself to be a positive and forceful reminder of the legacy of the movement of the 60's. A legacy proving that people are willing to take a stand for freedom, equality, and social justice. A legacy pointing to the need for major social changes if those goals are to be reached. This time, the target is U.S. corporations and the arguments and actions are geared towards ending their critically needed support for the minority Southern African regimes.

While an anti-apartheid movement has existed in the U.S. for a number of years, it is really since the June 16, 1976 Soweto uprisings, that student anger over U.S. corporate support for apartheid erupted. The brutal murder of Steve Biko, which stirred the entire world community, reinforced a burgeoning campus commitment to action.

This past spring saw an escalation of student actions which stunned campus administrators,corporate executives, and government officials. April 14 through May 1 saw two weeks of co-ordinated actions at schools throughout the Northeast--Brandeis, Columbia, Cornell, Amherst, M.I.T., Princeton, Vassar, Yale, Dartmouth, Wellsley, Smith, Harvard, Rutgers, Tufts, Swathmore, Williams, the University of Pennsylvania, Wesleyan, and Brown-- put down their books and marched, picketed, and rallied to the cry of "University investments out of South Africa." The West Coast was no less active with demonstrations occuring on 7 of the University of California campuses, Stanford, and several other private schools,all culminating with a series of sit-ins which forced the University of California Board of Regents to hold a state-wide public forum on the issue. Campuses in the mid-west, southeast, and southwest also reported anti-apartheid protests.

Over two years has passed and the movement shows signs of a growing degree of coordination and consolidation. Regional conferences and organizations have come together in the northeast, leading to the establishment of the Northeast Coalition for the Liberation of Southern Africa(NECLSA), and in the west, Campuses

United Against Apartheid(CUAA). The fall of '78 will see a southeastern conference at Duke University, a midwestern conference at Northwestern University, and a southwestern conference at the University of Texas.

Similiarly, the establishment of the South Africa Catalyst Project, a collective of students based at Stanford, and it's companion collective in the northeast, has played a key role in providing resources, skills, and energy to the movement both in California and the rest of the nation. The group maintains contact with student anti-apartheid groups throughout the nation, helps coordinate regional actions, puts out a national anti-apartheid activists newsletter, and periodic research and organizing pamphlets.

Demands for University Divestment

While the tactics vary from campus to campus, the immediate goal is well articulated by the chants from a demonstration at Wesleyan University this past spring. As Trustees were meeting to consider the issue, over 200 students marched through campus chanting: "Vorster,Apartheid, We say No! Wesleyan stocks have got to go!" Divestment of university held stocks in U.S. corporations operating in South Africa is the major focus of most campus movements.

While the local demands and forms of protest taken by students have varied, the rapid expansion(in numbers, intensity, and sophistication) of action indicates a movement not of naive idealism, but of collectively demonstrated strength, commitment, and purpose.

As the movement grows(as of now, 110 schools have antiapartheid groups) the range of campuses involved gets wider. From small liberal arts colleges, such as Oberlin and Grinell, to large public universities, such as the University of Michigan, and Indiana State, to state and community colleges such as California State Dominquez, and Philadelphia Community College, and religious schools, such as Loyola University, the issue of university investments, U.S. corporations, and South Africa has become a major focus of student organizing.

Anti-apartheid activists at Stanford University, which owns $120 million worth of stocks in South Africa-related corporations have served as a spur for much of the growing nation-wide movement. In may of 1977, in the first major sit-in over South Africa, 294 students were arrested over demands that the University support a stockholders' resolution calling for withdrawal by Ford Motor Co. from South Africa. The Stanford Committee for a Responsible Investment Policy(SCRIP) has continued its efforts, and during the spring of '78, organized three sit-ins involving over 300 people.

Freezing and snowing weather has not stopped students at Princeton. Between 100 and 250 people turned out every day for noon-time picketlines starting in the cold days of February, and continuing through the end of May. A mid-April occupa-

tion of an administration building, by the People's Front for the Liberation of Southern Africa persuaded U.N. Ambassador, Leslie Harriman to convene a special session of the U.N. Committee Against Apartheid on May 9. The committee declared their intentions: "To maintain closest cooperation with the student groups concerned in order to promote a world-wide campaign for the total isolation of the apartheid regime and for maximum support to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement."

The nine branches of the University of California system have all coordinated their efforts through CUAA, calling for divestment by the U.C. Regents and the withdrawal of funds in the Bank of America. During the '77-'78 school year, students collected over 10,000 signatures for divestment; staged picketlines, forums, and student-administration negociations; and finally, sit-ins at university and state government offices involving several hundred students. The presence of Governor Jerry Brown on the U.C. Board of Regents, the interest of former SDS activist Tom Hayden, (who now leads a group called Campaign for Economic Democracy), and state-wide coordinated Bank of America pickets have elevated protests around corporate activity in South Africa to a state-wide political issue.

Harvard University, the site of militant demonstrations in the early '70's over Harvard's stock in Gulf Oil (which had virtual monopoly control over Angola), was the site of one of the largest campus anti-apartheid demonstrations ever. In early May '78, over 3,500 Harvard students marched to protest nearly $400 million invested in corporations and banks with ties to South Africa.

Goals and Objectives

The goals of those who make up the still maturing movement runs widely across the political spectrum. Some feel compelled to issue a moral protest against what is accurately perceived as incredible burtality and oppression. Others feel that the issue of multi-national corporations and apartheid highlights a problem of even greater significance, and are commited to building a movement to break-up what is seen as a structure of capitalism and imperialism, whose underlying tenant is profit by exploitation.

The development of a strong movement supporting the liberation struggles and opposing U.S. involvement-- corporate and otherwise-- is the goal uniting all the student activists. Yet, within this framework, several goals are articulated.

The importance of informing Americans about the role of U.S. corporate investment in Southern Africa--that is, support for, and profits from apartheid-- is widely recognized. Further along, some argue, when push comes to shove and U.S. investments in South Africa are threatened, the American public must be prepared to say NO! to any form of U.S. support--military intervention or otherwise--

for the forces of repression and racism in Southern Africa.

A second goal links this education to effective action--forcing U.S. corporations and banks to withdraw--and at the least, halting the further expansion, investments, and loans that prop up the South African government. Student activists note that the amount of stocks held in total by American colleges and universities are a pressure point on the corporations. Added to this is the fact that the investments of U.S. companies in South Africa generally amounts to less than 1% of their total world-wide investments. These two combined factors--poor public relations or the "hassle-factor" , and the relative insignificance of their South African operations would induce them to get out.

Several campus groups have emphasized the relationship between U.S. multinationals investing in brutality and exploitation in South Africa while investment capital for social need in the U.S.-- housing, mass transit, alternative energy-- is nowhere to be found. Activists at Dartmouth College have done indepth research on this issue and are proposing divestment coupled with alternative investment opportunities for university funds.

The links between racism in the U.S. and in South Africa have been stressed by some, especially with the Bakke case threatening to bring back the unstated "color bars" in jobs and education in the U.S. For example, in April '78, over 300 Cornell students blocked the exit of a trustee meeting over demands for divestment, opposition to the Bakke case, and funding for Third World studies programs. At the New Brunswick campus of Rutgers University, the Anti-Apartheid Alliance has focused their energy on Third World funding programs, and inadequate campus housing, as well as university divestment.

Successes

Initially, many student anti-apartheid groups find themselves confronting unsympathetic administrators and intransigent trustees. In spite of this, the divestment movement has scored several successes.

After a four day building takeover in May of '77, students at Hampshire College were successful in forcing their trustees to sell $200,000 of the school's portfolio which included South African tainted stocks. At the University of Massachusetts, student pressure through petitions and marches, resulted in a decision by the administration to sell nearly $650,00 of stocks in apartheid-related investments.

Student and community pressure in Madison, led to a ruling by the Wisconsin Attorney General stating that investments by the University of Wisconsin in corporations operating in South Africa were illegal because of state laws which prohibit public funds being invested in corporations which practice racial discrim-

ination. While the ruling didn't result in complete divestment, several million dollars of stock have been sold.

While denying any pressure from organized student divestment campaigns on each campus, Harvard and Tufts have withdrawn deposits in American banks which have extended loans to the Vorster regime.

Problems: Challenges to Divestment

Several schools have encountered problems after successfully organizing divestment campaigns. Responding to student and community protests, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education was forced to divest of $6 million in South African holdings. However, the sale has been held up, as state officials are challenging the power of the Board of Education to authorize such actions. Supporters of South African liberation are presently fighting to push the withdrawal through.

A similiar challenge has risen elsewhere--only in this case directly from the corporations being threatened. After divestment received overwhelming support from a student referendum, the trustees of Ohio University voted to divest of $52,000. However, indicating the substantial effect even such a relatively small divestment protest has on the collective "consciousness" of U.S. corporations, the Ohio University Trustees have since reconsidered their decision. This came after several of the corporations involved threatened to withdraw grants they had previously made to the university. So much for academic freedom!

University Investments: Where to Begin

The first step in a campaign around university investments and South Africa involves researching the financial holdings of a school, identifying which investments are linked to South Africa, and detailing the specific role played by those corporations in maintaining the apartheid system.

To uncover the corporate investments of a university, check the school's yearly financial statement. This document, which will detail such things as operating expenses and sources of income, will usually list a school's financial investments: stock holdings in individual corporations and common funds, corporate and municipal bonds, bank notes, real estate, etc. Such reports can usually be obtained at a school's business office or library. Don't hestitate to talk with your school's treasurer or financial manager--he or she obviously knows the answers to your questions. A sympathetic trustee can also give you such information. Faculty, and you as a student government representative likewise often have access to these reports.

To find out which U.S. corporations operate in South Africa,

The Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of International Commerce(Washington,D.C. 20230) puts out a list of American Firms, Subsidiaries and Affiliates identifying U.S. firms in foreign countries, containing address, brief description of operations and name of parent company. Ask for the list for South Africa. The cost is $1.00. The Directory of American Firms Operating in Foreign Countries(World Trade Academy Press, New York, 1966) can also be checked for this information.

Information detailing the specific role played by a particular corporation in supporting the apartheid system can be found in many places. The bibliography in the back of this guide lists several references.

The handbook, Church Investments, U.S. Corporations, and Southern Africa, put out by the Corporate Information Center(see resource list), though a few yearssold, is till quite useful in providing information on the activities of particular corporations. CIC has also produced several reports on the Southern African operations of specific corporations. Contact them for more information.

The recently published Senate report by the Clark Subcommitte on African Affairs, U.S. Corporate Interests in Africa(see bibliography),should be checked for background information on U.S. corporate activity in Southern Africa, particularly the employment practices of these corporations. Likewise the pamphlet U.S. Investment in South Africa, published by the South Africa Catalyst Project, provides background information on particular corporate activity. The American Committee on Africa has several pamphlets and fact sheets on U.S. corporate activity, particularly bank loans, which are available on request(see resource list).

The Investor Responsibility Research Center(IRRC) is a research organization established to provide universities and other large institutional investors with background information on corporate practices to further "socially responsible" investment decisions. They have put out several reports on U.S. corporate practices in Southern Africa. While each individual report is quite expensive, many universities subscribe to the service and receive all the Center's publications. Check the business office of your school to find out if they are IRRC members.

The corporations themselves can be the source of some very revealing information. Write to them care of their national headquarters asking for information about their South African operation. Oftentimes, they have put together a glossy public relations leaflet to "pretty up" their South African connections. The addresses of national headquarters of corporations can be found in any one of the standard guides listing U.S. corporations such as Standard and Poor's Register, Moody's, or Dun and Bradstreet.

Finally, check relevant newspapers and business journals. If you have access to South African publications, the international weekly edition of The Star of Johannesburg, and the Financial Mail along with the British Economist, and The Financial Times of London, often have items of interest on American investment in South Africa.

Shareholder Resolutions: Arguments For and Against Their Use

The question of shareholder resolutions has to be raised within the context of a general campaign for withdrawal. Every year in the spring the 'proxy season' arrives, when corporations poll their shareholders (universities included) on general policy issues, among them the church-initiated resolutions on non-expansion in and withdrawal from South Africa. These provide issues around which to organize -- they force the university to look into the issue and take a public stand -- but focusing a withdrawal campaign on the demand for sympathetic proxy votes has its weaknesses as well as strengths, and these demand careful consideration.

Against Shareholder Resolutions

Several arguments are advanced against their use.

Advocating shareholder resolutions means tacitly endorsing the notion that there is a possibility for U.S. corporations to be reformed from the inside. This can be educationally misleading, it is argued, for if corporate structures, which are the basis for the system of apartheid, can be reformed from within, why can't U.S. businesses use their positions as "progressive models of social change" to break down racism and exploitation through reform on the inside?

Realistically, such resolutions can have little if any impact on corporate policy. A writer for the Chronicle of Higher Education has noted: "No shareholder's resolution on South Africa, even one asking a corporation to sign a modest fair employment pledge, has ever won more than a handful of votes." Beginning in 1970 with "Campaign GM" and continuing annually at stockholder conventions, churches and other concerned parties have pushed shareholder resolutions as a tactic of trying to force corporations to withdraw from South Africa. Rarely have they received more than 3% of the vote -- the minimum required to keep the issue on the agenda of the next year's annual convention. At shareholder conventions in 1978, 21 resolutions were presented calling for some movement towards withdrawal. Of those 21, only 14 received the 3% minimum with only three receiving more (barely) than 5%.

It is also pointed out that shareholder resolutions get muffled within corporate meeting rooms. Their ability to attract media attention is very limited and thus pressure on the corporation comes from a very small audience. The educational impact is also limited. Divestment, on the other hand, makes the point about corpor-

ate withdrawal direct, loud, sharp, and painful. Divestment of stocks by a university or college is bad public relations; it's much more of an embarrassment because of its more extreme and final nature, and hence greater ability to attract press. The tactic of shareholders resolutions directs most of one's focus toward changing the minds of corporate shareholders. Divestment as a tactic instead shoots for changing corporate policy through public pressure.

Finally, the mechanics of shareholder resolutions by their very nature require a fair amount of time. However, the rapidly worsening situation in Southern Africa -- Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia as well as South Afric -- demands strong and immediate protests. Divestment makes such a forceful and immediate statement.

For Shareholder Resolutions

Student anti-apartheid organizers who have developed some form of demands involving shareholder resolutions most often see their use as being a tactical decision in an overall strategy geared towards generating a broadly based movement opposed to U.S. involvement in Southern Africa. The use of shareholder resolutions is a moderate action, and thus allows the issue to be raised and discussed by a larger number of people. Divestment, because of its more radical nature, potentially closes the minds of some people who might otherwise be convinced of the need for corporate withdrawal.

Such assessments are based on several conditions. A student body that is not fully aware of the role played by U.S. corporations in Southern Africa may not be totally unconvinced of the historical inability of shareholder resolutions to affect corporate policy. However, it is hoped that after consistent education around the issue, widespread support for the principle of U.S. corporate withdrawal from South Africa, and the more forceful action of divestment, will develope.

The amount of money invested is another factor. At universities where millions of dollars are involved, sometimes representing up to 40% of a school's portfolio, demands for immediate divestment may be considered extreme. Shareholder resolutions, it is argued, allow a dialogue between students and administrators to develope, as voting for withdrawal resolutions is much easier for an administration to agree upon. With investments in South Africa-related corporations of nearly $400 million, the Harvard Southern Africa Solidarity Committee began its organizing on the principle that the administration should use its rather sizable power as a shareholder -- both in economic and psychological terms -- to push for corporate withdrawal.

Some groups have explicitly combined the two possible courses of action as part of a stage by stage process. That is, first work for withdrawal within the

corporations. If that fails to pull the corporations out of South Africa, then demand divestment. Students at Amherst College have followed such a process, calling for a two year period of support for withdrawal resolutions, and then divestment. Through such demands, they have been very successful in mobilizing a fairly conservative student body and faculty in support of U.S. corporate withdrawal, with many now advocating immediate divestment instead of the two-stage process.

Several schools have taken action on resolutions. Bryn Mawr College sponsored a resolution calling on Kodak to restrict its sales to the South African government. Similarly, Haverford College initiated a resolution calling for complete withdrawal by Motorola. After organized student pressure, the University of Illinois agreed to support resolutions that "seek a moratorium on further investment in South Africa, prudent withdrawal of investment from South Africa or disclosure of information on corporate activities there."

Administration Response I: Administration-Sponsored Investment Advisory Committees

If Martians landed on campus and began eating the students, the administration would undoubtly set up a committee to investigate the affair and write a report. Not surprisingly,demands for withdrawal are almost always met with the establishment of investment advisory committees. These committees do represent a kind of victory (what university would look into the ethics of its South African investments without being forced to?), but they are also a danger, and deserve serious thought.

When millions of dollars of stock holdings are in question, the need for some kind of study committee is not unreasonable. Typically, such committees are charged with examining the role played by corporations in South Africa; researching the financial effects of divestment on the university; and finding alternative options for investment. Members are drawn from the university community-- trustees, administrators, faculty, and students. Representation can, and has been an issue of struggle between students and administrators -- i.e., having university employees on the board -- but there are other perils to committee work.

First, many campus activists see these committees as being simply a diversionary tactic on the part of the administration. Evidence detailing the negative effects of U.S. corporate operations in South Africa is widely available, and the issue is overwhelmingly clear right now. Setting up a committe to "study" the effects of U.S. corporations in South Africa, in reality, serves only to delay the trustees from having to make a final decision on the issue -- i.e., trying to put off a confrontation with a committed and mobilized student body, hoping that by dragging the "study" process out and limiting student involvement to papers and debate, sentiment will be lost, and a strong movement will dribble away.

A greater danger is that the real issue -- corporate complicity in apartheid, university support of these corporations -- gets lost. Issues like the committee's real power over trustee decisions, and financial responsibility of the trustees, can make withdrawal an internal campus battle. From the issue of " this institution should take a stand against apartheid," administrators move the dialogue into trust law(is it illegal for trustees to lose money? it is their sacred duty to maximize profits) and campus power(students are only one part of a varied community, and can't speak for it; besides, "the university is not and never has claimed to be a democratic institution."). Finally, given the Establishment composition of most committees, should students abide by their decisions, or use them as tactics in a larger campaign?

Two considerations qualify these dangers. The first is simple; students can use these committees to show how undemocratic and profit-oriented universities are. The second is the "backfire potential" of these committees. As Vassar and Stanford, committees surprised the administration by urging some form of protest action opposing U.S. investments in South Africa. Trustees at both schools were then forced to reject the "balanced" and "carefully researched" recommendations of their own committee. This angers radical and liberal students and faculty, and brings home the limitations of committee advice and the need for public pressure.

Administration Response II: The Sullivan Principles

Many universities have responded to demands for a position against U.S. investments by endorsing the so-called "Sullivan Principles". The principles, developed by Rev. Leon Sullivan, a black minister and G.M. Board of Directors member, have been adopted by more than 60 U.S. corporations. They seem to be the tactic most used by businesses to deflect criticism of their South African operations.

The principles themselves call on corporations to support the following operating practices:

1. Non-segregation of the races in all eating, comfort, and work facilities.
2. Equal and fair employment practices for all employees.
3. Equal pay for all employees doing equal or comparable work for the same period of time.
4. Initiation and development of training programs that will prepare, in substantial numbers, Blacks and other non whites for supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs.
5. Increasing the number of Blacks and other non-whites in management and super-

visory positions.

6. Improving the quality of employees' lives outside the work environment in such areas as housing, transportation, schooling, recreation, and health facilities.

Thinking that the adoption of such principles are an answer to the growing student movement, university administrations including MIT, Tufts, Harvard, Wellesley, Columbia, Dartmouth, Swarthmore, Oberlin, and the University of Minnesota have established an "Ad Hoc Committee on the Sullivan Six Principles". The group has sent a letter out to over 200 schools urging them to adopt the Principles as a basis for investments in South Africa.

Principles rejected by anti-apartheid movement

Most student groups have rejected the Sullivan Principles, labeling them an attempt to hide the true nature of U.S. corporate support for, and profits from, the apartheid system.

The following excerpts from the pamphlet, "Too Little, Too Late", written by Jennifer Davis, research director of the American Committee on Africa, illustrate this position:

"In the abstract, the principles make unobjectionable reading. The catch lies in what they exclude, rather than what they include. There is no demand for any change in the fundamental structure of apartheid, no demand for black political rights, and, closer to home, no commitment to negotiating with black trade unions or demands for their recognition by the government.

"The fact that the 'principles' were endorsed by the South African government gives a clear indication of how far they fall short of presenting any challenge to apartheid.

"There can be no equality of opportunity in a country where one group of workers on the basis of skin color is excluded from education; is forced to live under exhausting conditions, often in crowded hostels, away from family or friends; is constantly subject to the threat of being arrested under a battery of special laws which control movement, the right to be in a particular place, the right to go out at night; where making any complaint about a job may lead not only to instant dismissal, but also to 'endorsement out' of a town, back to the bantustan where there are no jobs. Above all, there can be no equality of opportunity where one group of workers is denied the right to effective trade union organizations."

Tim Smith, director of the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility, notes:

"Many of the signatories of the principles act in ways that directly assist and strengthen the powers of South Africa's white rulers. Citibank has loaned $300 million directly to the South African government; IBM still provides computers to that government for any purpose, however repressive Caltex and Mobil are major suppliers of oil to the South African military, and through South Africa they are the oil lifeline to Rhodesia. Union Carbide assists apartheid by investing in and on the borders of bantustans. Caltex is in the midst of a $134 million expansion in white South Africa's future. The list goes on."

Other Targets of University Complicity with Apartheid

While the student movement has focused largely on university investments, other links between the university and apartheid have been targeted for protest.

The issue of conflict of interest has been one related area . Trustees of most colleges are often high-ranking officials in South Africa related corporations. For example, Williams College, has a trustee who is the President and Chief of Operations of Union Carbide -- a major mining company in both South Africa and Rhodesia. Students at Princeton have demanded, along with divestment, the resignation by several trustees from either their corporate position or their trustee position. Two of those trustees include the Chairman of the Board of Chemical Bank, which has made loans to the South African government, and Nicholas Katzenbach, a high ranking IBM official. Recently, Princeton President William Bower was added to the list when it was discovered that he serves as Director of NCR, a corporation which has supplied computers to the South African Defense Department.

Corporate recruiting on campuses is also a target of protest. From Smith College to the University of California at Santa Cruz, corporate recruiters have been counter-leafleted, picketed, and even forced off campus. A campus referendum at the University of Oregon, proposing divestment and the banning of recruiters from corporations with South African connections received the support of 75% of the student body.

The South Africa issue has also been taken into local campus communities. Students at the University of Minnesota picketed Control Data, a Minnesota-based firm which markets computers in South Africa. In Boston, students have done investigative research into a local plant of Badger Corporation, which has been instrumental in the development of a strategic South African government to oil processing plant.

The National Anti-Apartheid Movement: Actions to Oppose U.S. Involvement and Support the Liberation Movements

While the student movement can be crdited with making the issue of apartheid and U.S. corporations one of widespread concern and action, there are many other links that tie U.S. corporations and the U.S. government to policies that bolster the racist Southern African regimes. In communities all over the country, Third World organizations, community activists, trade unions, church groups, and political organizations have found ways of demonstrating their opposition to these links.

The resource list at the end of this pamphlet lists many organizations that can be contacted for more information on the following areas.

Lobbying and U.S. Foreign Policy

One area of active organizing has been lobbying efforts on Congress and the President to make U.S. foreign policy in Southern Africa truely reflect a committment to "human rights," instead of the present hypocritical under-handed support being given to the racist regimes.

Recent efforts have included letter writing and demonstrations urging the U.S. to discontinue government support for trade with South Africa through the government sponsored Export-Import Bank. Tax credits granted to U.S. parent corporations on their South African subsidaries provide incentives for businesses to operate in South Africa. The Washington Office on Africa provides updates and organizing assistance around this and other legislative issues.

Bank Loans

Several of the largest U.S. banks, including Morgan Guaranty, Chemical Bank, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, and Bank of America have all recently made loans to the South African regime. Following on the heels of Soweto in 1976, these loans were crucial in allowing South Africa to crush black protest, and reduce a mounting foreign deficet caused largely by the rising costs of the state's repressive appartus, state corporations, and defense budget.

Anti-bank loan coalitions have been organizing around the country pressuring both local, and large national banks to stop financing apartheid. Pickets, leafleting, mass withdrawals, and withdrawals by large institutional investors such as churches and unions have scored several minor successes, most notably a promise from Citibank not to make any new loans to the South African government. The Committee to Oppose Bank Loans to South Africa(COBLSA) is coordinating actions on this issue.

Ban Krugerrand Sales

U.S. sales of the Krugerrand, the South African gold coin, provide a substantial inflow of funds to the racist regime. Foreign gold sales are crucial to the survival of the South African regime, and to that end the South African government has initiated a $4 million mass media campaign to promote U.S. sales of the coin, hoping to earn over $100 million in foreign exchange. Anti-apartheid activists have thus focused their efforts on ending Krugerrand sales and have won several victories.

Demonstrations opposing Krugerrand sales by Merrill Lynch pressured local branches in Boston, Cleveland, San Antonio, Los Angeles, Eugene and Portland, Oregon. They were successful in forcing the nation's largest brokerage firm to discontinue the coin's sales.

Several major T.V. stations in New York, Chicago, and Boston have agreed to discontinue Krugerrand ads, while major department stores and coin shops all over

the country have also stopped coin sales.

Students at Clark University and the University of Connecticut were successful in forcing local coin dealers to discontinue Krugerrand sales. The American Committee on Africa(ACOA) is involved in organizing around this issue.

Municipal Actions

Community pressure in several places has lead to city council resolutions condemning apartheid and U.S. complicity. Madison, Wisconsin, Gary, Indiana, and Washington D.C. have all taken boycott action towards South Africa-linked corporations -- particularly IBM and ITT -- which hold city contracts.

Students at the University of California at Davis have played a leading role in initiating a city-wide referendum calling on the city of Davis to pull the city's funds out of banks and corporations doing business in South Africa. The referendum was approved in March of 1978 and the city is now looking into alternative investment opportunities.

Resources For Anti-Apartheid Oganizing

Information and Resource Organizations

1. AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA/AFRICA FUND, 305 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017; Pnone: (212)538-5030.
2. AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE--SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM, 1501 Chery St., Philadelphia, PA 19102, Phone:(215)241-7168.
3. AFRICAN BIBLIOGRAPHIC CENTER, 1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 901 Washington, D.C. 20036; Phone:(202) 223-1392.
   Washington Task Force on African Affairs it produces Habaree, a three minute daily report summarizing major news stories, meetings and publications concerning Africa. Dial (202) 659-2529.
4. AFRICA NEWS, P.O. Box 3851, Durham, N.C. 27702.
5. AFRICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION, 218 Shiffman Humanities Center, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02154.
6. BLACK LIBERATION PRESS, P.O. Box 955, Harlem, N.Y. 10027.
7. CALIFORNIA NEWSREEL'S SOUTHERN AFRICA MEDIA CENTER, 630 Natoma Street, SanFrancsico, CA 94103; Phone: (415) 621-6196.
8. INTERFAITH CENTER ON CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY?CORPORATE INFORMATION CENTER, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027, Phone: (212)870-2294.
9. INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES, 1901 Q St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20009; Phone: (202)234-9382.
10. LIBERATION SUPPORT MOVEMENT, LSM Information Cemter, P.O. Box 2077 Oakland, CA 94604.

Corporate Research Organizations

1. AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA, 305 E. 46the St. New Yirk, N.Y. 10017 Phone:(212)538-5030.

2. COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE BANK LOANS TO SOUTH AFRICA, 305 E. 46th ST., New York, N.Y. 10017, Pnone:(212) 538-5030. Formed to pressure banks into adopting a policy of no loans to South Africa, COBOLSA has detailed information on American banks involvement in South Africa as well as contacts and current information on bank campaign activities in the entire U.S.

3. CORPORATE DATA EXCHANGE, 198 Broadway, Rm. 706-7, New York, N.Y. 10038, Phone: (212) 962-2980. CDE specializes in researching and undercovering the intracacies of corporate investment. They are a major source of information on the details of bank loans to South Africa, and are publishing the most up-to-date and in-depth study of bank loans. The hamdbook will be available for $5 from September.

Action Organizations

AMERICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EQUALITY IN SPORTS AND SOCIETY c/o Richard Lapchick--Dept. of Political Science, Virginia Weselyan University, Norfolk, VA 23502. Focusing on South Africa participation in American and international sports events.

BOSTON COALITION FOR THE LOBERATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA, P.O. Box 101, Boston, MA 02123. A very active group involved in a campaign against First National Bank of Boston's loans to South Africa, and active in ending the sale of the Krugerrand in many Boston stores. They put out a newsletter covering Boston anti-apartheid activities and general news on Southern Africa.

CHICAGO COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN AFRICA, 22 E. Van Buren, Chicago, Ill. 60605, phone:(312)427-4351. Actively opposing bank loans to South Africa and sponsoring education events on Southern Africa.

CHICAGO COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA LIBERATION/NEW WORLD RESOURCE CENTER 1476 West Irving Park Road, Chicago, ILL. 60613, phone:(312)348-3370. A local group providing a wide range of resources including speakers, films and literature on Southern Africa.

CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED, 198 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10038, phone:(212)964-6730. A national organization involved in anti-banl loan campaigns in several cities. Write to inquire about the activities of local chapters.

COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE BANK LOANS TO SOUTH AFRICA, 305 E. 46th St., New York, N.Y. 10017, phnoe:(212)538-5030. National organization co-ordinating opposition to bank loans to South Africa. COBLSA provides resources and information to support local activities around the issue of bank loans. Its major activities include sponsoring demonstrations at banks and organizing campaigns to get depositors to withdrawal their money from banks loaning to South Africa. Write to find out hwat you can do and to find out where local campaigns already exist.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST RACISM IN SPORTS, 624 Clark St. Evanston, Ill. 60680. Working to exclude South Africa from international sports events.

MADISON AREA COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN AFRICA, 731 State St., Madison Wisconsin 53603. A community-based group involved in anti-apartheid activities. Publishes a newsletter, MACSA News, available for a donation of $5.

MILWAUKEE COMMITTEE ON SOUTH SFRICA, 2711 Juneau Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53208. Active in opposing bank loans to South Africa and doing educational work.

MINNEAPOLIS CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED, 122 W. Franklin Ave., Mineapolis, Minn. 55404.

CHARLOTTE SOUTHERN AFRICA COMMITTEE, 719 Templeton Ave., Charlotte, N.C. 28203. Pressuring North Carolina National Bank to end its loan to South AFrica.

COALITION TO END BANKING ON APARTHEID, c/o War Resisters League, 108 Purefoy Road, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.

NORTHEAST COALITION FOR THE LIBERATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA, c/o South AfricaCatalyst Project, 305 E. 46th St., New York, N.Y. 10017. Coalition of campus groups which co-ordinates regional campus activities, puts out a monthly newletter and sponsors regional conference on anti-apartheid organizing.

PORTLAND CITIZENS AGAINST RACISM, Box 12262, Portland Ore. 97212. Involved in pressuring banks to end loans to South Africa and sponsoring educational events.

ROCHESTER AD HOC COMMITTEE AGAINST BANK LOANS TO SOUTH AFRICA, 713 Monroe Ave., Rochester, N.Y. 14607.

$TOP NAKING ON APARTHEID, 2160 Lake Street, San Francisco, CA 94121 phone:(415)752-7761. Active group focusing on bank loans issue and distributing resources on apartheid and U.S. bank involvement.

SOUTH AFRIC ACTION COALITION, 1811 W. 16th Ave., Rm. 201, Vancouver B.C. V65 2M3, Canada. An active organization working on many issues including bank loans and political prisoners, as well as sponsoring educational events.

TORONTO COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA, 121 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada MJR 2G3, phone:(476)967-5562.

UNITED STATES STUDENT ASSOCIATION Suite 300 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 667-6000 Lobby, publications, interns, student views.

SOUTHERN AFRICA LIBERATION MOVEMENT REPRESENTATIVES

J.M. Makatini(acting), AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA, 310 East 44th St., New York, N.Y. 10017, phone:(212)490-3487.

David Sibeko, PAN AFRICANIST CONGRESS OF AZANIA, 211 East 43rd St., New York, N.Y. 10017, phone:(212)986-7378.

Theo Ben Gurirab, SWAPO Observor Mission to the UN, 801 Second Ave., #1401, New York, N.Y. 10017, phone:(212)986-7863.

Tirivafi. ZANU(The Patriotic Front), 211 East 43rd St., New York, N.Y. 10017, phone:(212)697-7910.

Callistus Ndlovu, ZAPU(The Patriotic Front), 104 East 40th St., New York, N.Y. 10017, phone:(212)682-8481.